

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated September 21, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 11-12, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr et al. (US 6,391,378) in view of Yamada et al. (US 6,001,203), Enchi et al. (US 6,455,099) and Levey et al. (US 5,409,545). Further, claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr et al. (US 6,391,378) in view of Yamada et al. (US 6,001,203), Enchi et al. (US 6,455,099) and Levey et al. (US 5,409,545) and further in view of Kjtamura et al. (US 6,139,639). Further, claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr et al. (US 6,391,378) in view of Yamada et al. (US 6,001,203), Enchi et al. (US 6,455,099) and Levey et al. (US 5,409,545) and further in view of Kitahara et al. (US 6,595,819). Further, claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr et al. (US 6,391,378) in view of Yamada et al. (US 6,001,203), Enchi et al. (US 6,455,099) and Levey et al. (US 5,409,545) and further in view of Vinouze et al. (US 5,431,771).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Claims 11 and 14 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 12 and 13 have been cancelled. In particular, the features of claim 12 have been incorporated into claim 11. Accordingly, claims 11 and 14-17 are presently pending.

Claims Rejections to 35 USC §103

Claims 11-12, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr et al. (US 6,391,378) in view of Yamada et al. (US 6,001,203), Enchi et al. (US 6,455,099) and Levey et al. (US 5,409,545). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as being based on references that neither describe nor suggest the features now recited in independent claim 11, as

amended. For example, independent claim 11 now recites, features, “lowering a body supporting a syringe having a nozzle at one end until the nozzle contacts a substrate using a vertical driving motor, wherein the vertical driving motor drives the syringe according to driving data input from a user through an input unit which comprises one of a touch panel and a keyboard; detecting an initial value between the nozzle and the substrate by turning on or tuning off a contact type switch by lifting up the body when the nozzle contacts the substrate, wherein the initial value is a distance between the nozzle and the substrate when the nozzle is in contact with the substrate.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Carr et al., in view of Yamada et al. and further Enchi et al. in view of Levey et al. fail to teach or suggest “the vertical driving motor drives the syringe according to driving data input from a user through an input unit which comprises one of a touch panel and a keyboard; and detecting an initial value between the nozzle and the substrate by turning on or tuning off a contact type switch by lifting up the body when the nozzle contacts the substrate, wherein the initial value is a distance between the nozzle and the substrate when the nozzle is in contact with the substrate” as recited in amended independent claim 11.

In the contrast to the presently claimed invention, Carr et al. discloses that the touch probe 20 includes a lower housing 22, a pneumatic actuator 24, and a cylinder 26 extends from the pneumatic actuator, and a proximity sensor 36 is mounted on one side of the lower housing and is implemented using an electromagnetic field to detect a metal target. Further, Yamada et al. discloses that nozzles are used to deposit liquid crystal display material or sealing material in LCDs. Further, Enchi et al. discloses that when moving nozzles relative to substrates for dispensing materials such as sealants, it is suitable to lift the nozzle at a slower rate than the lowering. Further, Enchi et al. discloses that the use of contact switches in order to provide feedback when servo motors have brought something into a desired position. But, Carr et al. in view of Yamada et al. and further Enchi et al. in view of Levey et al. do not disclose “the vertical driving motor drives the syringe according to driving data input from a user through an input unit which comprises one of a touch panel and a keyboard; and detecting an initial value between the nozzle and the substrate by turning on or tuning off a contact type switch by lifting up the body when the nozzle contacts the substrate, wherein the initial value is a distance between the nozzle and the substrate when the nozzle is in contact with the substrate ” as recited in the claimed invention.

Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Carr et al. in view of Yamada et al. and further Enchi et al. in view of Levey et al. do not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in independent claim 11, as amended.

For at least the above reasons, Carr et al., in view of Yamada et al., and further Enchi et al., in view of Levey et al. fail to describe or suggest each and every feature recited in independent claim 11, as amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of independent claim 11, as amended, be withdrawn. Further, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of dependent 14-17 be withdrawn at least because of their dependence on independent claim 11, and for additional features that they recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 21, 2008

By: Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: **53,005**
McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP
1900 K St. NW
Washington DC, 20006
Tel: 202.496.7500
Attorney for Applicants